

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: John McDonough, City Manager

DATE: For submission on the agenda of the March 21, 2017 City Council Meeting

ITEM: Consideration of Approval of a Contract Award to Taser International, Inc. to provide Body Camera Equipment, Accessories and Services for the City of Sandy Springs Police Department

Background

On September 7, 2016, the City issued its Request for Proposal ("RFP") to solicit and select a company to provide Body Camera Equipment, Accessories and Services for the City of Sandy Springs Police Department ("SSPD"). On October 5, 2016, the City received responses to the RFP ("Proposals") from the following five (5) companies ("Offerors"):

-) Citadel
-) Digital Alley
-) Motorola Solutions, Inc.
-) Taser International, Inc.
-) Utility Associates

The committee evaluating Proposals ("Evaluation Committee") reviewed the submittals and recommended that only four (4) Offerors had a reasonable expectation of receiving a contract award; therefore, those Offerors moved forward for further consideration.

Discussion

The Evaluation Committee invited each of the four (4) Offerors selected for further consideration to present its Proposal and demonstrate the proposed body camera equipment. Following presentations and further evaluation, three (3) of the four (4) Offerors that presented Proposals were invited to provide SSPD with camera equipment and accessories for trial/testing. The three (3) Offerors selected for trial/testing of equipment were:

-) Motorola Solutions, Inc.
-) Taser International, Inc.
-) Utility Associates
-)

The Evaluation Committee and six (6) testing officers met to discuss the results after conclusion of the trial. Using the criteria described in the RFP, the Evaluation Committee reviewed the following to make its final recommendation:

-) Proposals submitted;
-) formal presentations/demonstrations;
-) trial scores; and
-) cost

Taser International, Inc.'s evaluation scores were among the highest in all competing categories. It is, therefore, the unanimous recommendation of the Evaluation Committee that Taser International, Inc., be awarded the contract to provide Body Camera Equipment, Accessories and Services for the City of Sandy Springs Police Department, in accordance with the attached Evaluation Memorandum.

Alternative

Reject the recommendation and provide further instruction to the City Manager and staff.

Recommendation

See attached Source Evaluation Memorandum for RFQ 17-006 for the summary recommendation.

Attachment

Evaluation Memorandum

**STATE OF GEORGIA
COUNTY OF FULTON**

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CONTRACT AWARD TO TASER
INTERNATIONAL, INC. TO PROVIDE BODY CAMERA EQUIPMENT,
ACCESSORIES AND SERVICES FOR THE CITY OF SANDY SPRINGS POLICE
DEPARTMENT AND TO AUTHORIZE THE NEGOTIATION AND EXECUTION
OF A CONTRACT**

WHEREAS, the City of Sandy Springs (“City”) conducted a solicitation to select a qualified vendor/company to provide all services required to fully implement a body worn camera system for the City of Sandy Springs Police Department; and

WHEREAS, the City issued its Body Camera Equipment Request for Proposal Number 17-006 for Body Camera Equipment, Accessories and Services (“RFP”) on September 7, 2016, with responses due not later than October 5, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the City received responses to the RFP (“Proposals”) from the following five (5) companies: Citadel; Digital Alley; Motorola Solutions, Inc.; Taser International, Inc.; and Utility Associates; and

WHEREAS, Proposals received were evaluated by an evaluation committee selected by the City Manager (“Evaluation Committee”), consistent with criteria established by the terms of the RFP; and

WHEREAS, as a result of its evaluation of Proposals, the Evaluation Committee has provided its Evaluation Memorandum, in the form attached to this resolution as Exhibit “A”, presenting the results of its evaluation and its recommendations for contract award for a company to provide body camera equipment, accessories and services for the City of Sandy Springs Police Department; and

WHEREAS, City Council desires to approve the recommendations of the Evaluation Committee consistent with the attached Evaluation Memorandum.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Sandy Springs, Georgia, while in regular session on March 21, 2017, at 6:00 p.m., that the following recommendations of the Evaluation Committee are hereby approved:

1. Taser International, Inc. is hereby selected as the company to provide body camera equipment, accessories and services for the City of Sandy Springs Police Department.
2. The City Manager and the City Attorney are hereby authorized to proceed to negotiate a contract with Taser International, Inc. to provide body camera equipment, accessories and services for the City of Sandy Springs Police Department.

3. The City Manager is hereby authorized to execute the negotiated contract with Taser International, Inc., subject to approval of the City Attorney; and
4. The City Manager and the City Attorney are hereby authorized to take such actions deemed necessary or prudent to effectuate the intent of this resolution.

RESOLVED this the 21st day of March, 2017.

Approved:

Russell K. Paul, Mayor

Attest:

Michael D. Casey, City Clerk

(Seal)

EXHIBIT “A”

**EVALUATION MEMORANDUM
Solicitation Number RFP #17-006
Body Camera Equipment, Accessories, and Services**

EVALUATION MEMORANDUM

Solicitation Number RFP #17-006
Body Camera Equipment, Accessories, and Services

A. INTRODUCTION

The City of Sandy Springs ("City") issued a Request for Proposal ("RFP") for Body Camera Equipment, Accessories, and Services - RFP #17-006 on September 7, 2016. The City solicited proposals from highly qualified vendors to provide all services required to fully implement a body worn camera system ("System"). Initial deployment is anticipated to consist of camera systems to outfit approximately 70 cameras. The number of cameras may be increased or decreased annually. The Offeror selected for contract award will be managed and directed by the City's Police department.

Per the Scope of Services outlined in the RFP, the selected Offeror shall provide a System consisting of a comprehensive solution that shall enable video and audio recording from a police officer's perspective. It must be designed to archive, manage, and quickly retrieve video data that meets or exceeds federal, state, and local standards.

The City's objectives in issuing the RFP for Body Camera Equipment, Accessories, and Services are to ensure the highest degree of safety for its employees and citizens and to operate a safe and effective body camera system while protecting both its officers and citizens.

B. EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Responses to the RFP ("Responses") were evaluated by individuals selected by the City Manager ("Evaluation Committee") using the criteria set forth in the RFP. Members of the Evaluation Committee were:

-) Keith Zgonc – Deputy Chief, City of Sandy Springs Police Department
-) Jim Fraker – Captain, City of Sandy Springs Police Department
-) James McNabb – Sergeant, City of Sandy Springs Police Department
-) Jonathan Crowe – IT Director, City of Sandy Springs
-) Jesse Cail – Technology Security Officer, City of Sandy Springs

In addition, the following advisors assisted the Evaluation Committee with expertise in areas critical to the success of the Project:

-) Karen Ellis – Finance Director, City of Sandy Springs
-) Wendell Willard – City Attorney, City of Sandy Springs
-) Nesby Ingram – Purchasing Manager, City of Sandy Springs

C. RFP

General: The solicitation was released on September 7, 2016. Questions were due from Offerors no later than September 16, 2016, 5:00 p.m. To ensure maximum outreach and competition, the City advertised the RFP on the City's website and on the Georgia Procurement Registry. The City's Purchasing Department issued one (1) addendum in response to questions from interested Offerors.

The Purchasing Department conducted an initial review of each proposal submitted for administrative compliance. No administrative compliance issues were noted.

In order for the City to adequately compare and evaluate submittals, all Offerors were asked to submit proposals that addressed the City's requirements, provided Offeror's cover letter, company profile, company experience, management team composition and Technical staff. The system must be designed to archive, manage, and quickly retrieve video data that meets or exceeds federal, state, and local standards. **At a minimum, the System shall incorporate the eighteen (18) core operating characteristics recommended by the Department of Justice ("DOJ") FY206 Body Worn Camera Grant Announcement.** In addition, the system shall include everything needed for successful implementation. Such as the installation and configuration of hardware, software, back-end services and integrations, peripheral hardware and software, technical support, as well as on-site training and certification for operators and administrators.

RFP Evaluation Criteria: Section 6(B) of the RFP identified the criteria on which the City would base the evaluation of Responses. The criteria were as follows:

1. Technical Proposal

- a. **Technical Functionality:** Address each point in the Scope of Services and specification section of this RFP. Describe their camera's functions, wear ability, ease of uploading data, cloud storage, power charging, and how upgrades are handled. List and/or describe all benefits/ features. **(60 POINTS)**
- b. **Qualifications and Business Stability:** Provide a simple organization chart depicting the Offeror's team structure. If a joint venture Offeror specify who is the lead vendor for contract compliance, communication and invoice submittal, etc. Provide a single short paragraph outlining the experience of each of your integration and technical support team members and the leading firm /company information. How long has the company been in business? Provide list of major clients and references. **(15 POINTS)**

2. Fee/Cost Proposal

Complete the attached Fee/Cost Proposal sheet as instructed, and include all costs for items and services requested in the Scope of Services/Specification section of this RFP. **(25 POINTS)** Scores for pricing will be evaluated using the following criteria:

Offeror with Lowest price	= 25 points;
Offeror with Highest price	= 0 points;

All other Offerors will be assigned scores based on the price variance established by the lowest and highest price.

3. **Responses to RFP:** On October 5, 2016, 4:00 p.m., the City received five (5) submittals in response to the RFP from the following Respondents:

- Citadel
- Digital Alley
- Motorola Solutions
- Taser
- Utility Associates

4. **Evaluation of Proposals:** The Evaluation Committee began its review of Responses the week of October 17, 2016. The Evaluation Committee reviewed all submittals, completed its evaluations and reported its findings to the Purchasing Department. Based on the Evaluation Committee's findings, it was determined that the top four (4) ranked Offerors had a reasonable expectation of receiving a contract award; therefore, four (4) out of five (5) Offerors moved forward for further consideration to make presentations.

PROPOSER-COMPANY NAME		Citadel	Digital Ally	Motorola	Taser	Utility Associates
EVALUATOR	TOTAL AVAILABLE POINTS	TOTAL POINTS				
JF	75	51	65	65	75	75
KZ	75	51	65	65	75	75
JM	75	51	65	65	75	75
JC	75	29	48	55	73	75
JCAIL	75	29	53	48	73	73
GRAND TOTAL ALL POINTS		211	296	298	371	373

5. **Formal Interviews and Presentations:** The Purchasing Department invited the four (4) top Offerors to make presentations and demonstrate their equipment on November 9, 2016. The top ranked Offerors were:

- Digital Alley
- Motorola Solutions
- Taser
- Utility Associates

Each Offeror demonstrated the functionality of the proposed System, provided a brief overview of the company, and described why its System is the right choice for the Sandy Springs Police Department ("SSPD"). **(A maximum of 100 points was available for**

this phase). Each Offeror had one (1) hour and twenty (20) minutes to present their proposal and demonstrate their equipment with the following criteria:

-) Demonstrate video upload via any available avenues
-) Clarify and itemize any hardware required to sync with cloud storage
-) Viewing video via the portal
-) Redaction process
-) Export process
-) Process to share to outside agency in portal
-) Naming and assigning cameras to individuals
-) Articulate steps for AD integration
-) Articulate steps for CAD integration
-) Clarify if LTE required and if so, is it covered in the submitted cost sheets?
-) Demonstrate outside trigger activation
-) Clarify if the cost to retrofit vehicles is included
-) Explain how you integrate with other camera systems. Can we upload data from other systems tied to same case into your cloud storage?

After the presentations, the committee discussed the pros and cons of each presentation and the above criteria. It was a unanimous decision to advance three (3) of the four (4) Offerors to the next phase of Testing and Equipment Evaluation, granting maximum 100 of points to advance Offerors and 0 points for none advanced Offerors.

6. Testing and Evaluation of Equipment Phase

Following formal interviews, the top ranked Offerors were invited to provide SSPD with two (2) cameras, equipment and accessories for testing were:

-) Motorola Solution
-) Taser
-) Utility Associates,

SSPD assigned testing officers tested and evaluated the equipment during December 2016 and January 2017. The following trial and evaluation criteria survey was used to evaluate the Offerors equipment:

-) Trial Gear
-) Training / Configuration
-) Cameras (In the field)
-) Mounting
-) Docking
-) Customer Support
-) Mobile Application

Once the testing was completed, the cameras, equipment and accessories were returned to the presenting Offerors. **(A maximum of 100 points was available for this phase.)**

After the conclusion of the testing phase, the assigned testing SSPD Officers, the evaluation committee members and Purchasing met on January 17, 2017 to discuss the results of each camera system. The following members were in attendance:

-) Nesby Ingram (Purchasing) - Observer/Facilitator
-) Jim Fraker (PD) - Observer/Facilitator
-) James McNabb – Sergeant
-) Jesse Cail (IT) - Observer/Assist with questions on back-end connectivity
-) Jonathan Crowe (IT) - Observer/Assist with questions on back-end connectivity
-) Six (6) Testing Officers

Body Camera Trail and Evaluation Survey Score Totals:

Motorola		Taser		Utility	
Officer #1	Officer #2	Officer #1	Officer #2	Officer #1	Officer #2
53	58	84	76	55	62
111		160		117	

7. Selection Summary:

Using the evaluation criteria contained in Section 6 of the RFQ as a guide, the Evaluation Committee reviewed Respondents' proposals, presentations/ demonstration and testing Body camera equipment provided by **Motorola Solutions, Taser and Utility Associates, Inc.** and the results are as follows:

Offeror	Technical Capabilities and Approaches	Total Cost	Performance Confidence
Taser International	Acceptable	\$179,275	Satisfactory
Utility Associates	Acceptable	\$219,100	Satisfactory
Motorola Solutions	Acceptable	\$234,292	Unsatisfactory

Summary of Equipment Testing:

Motorola Solutions: The recommendation from field testers was split - 1 vote "Yes" and 1 vote "No". The "Yes" vote primarily came from the confidence the tester felt in doing his job and generally liked the effects of having the system. The "No" vote was based on poor battery performance, wearability and complexity of the system (the way it connects to radio, etc.). Each tester had to work with support on more than occasion.

Taser International, Inc.: The recommendation from both field testers was "Yes". The system was simple to use and worked reliably. Only one tester had to contact support during initial configuration, and the issue was resolved in an hour. One tester felt he could train the entire department on use of the system in a relatively short period.

Utility Associates, Inc.: The recommendation from both field testers was "No". Although there were a great deal of features, overall, the system was too complex and each component must be working 100% for the system to function. If any one of the components was not working properly, then the overall system failed. Of note were the two "discarded" videos from the field - ironically, these were the two most important videos that the officers recorded during their trial of the system. Each tester had to contact, and work with support on multiple occasions.

The Evaluation Committee considered the following factor in recommending Taser International, Inc.:

Taser evaluation scores were among the top ranked scored in all competing categories.

D. FINANCIAL REVIEW

Taser International Inc. was determined financially stable with positive credit ratings during the evaluation.

E. REFERENCE FINDINGS

Subsequent to making a decision on a recommendation for selection, references were contacted and were exceptionally positive.

F. RECOMMENDATION

For the reasons described above, the Evaluation Committee unanimously recommends that Taser International Inc. be awarded as the best-valued contract to provide Body Cameras, Equipment, Accessories and Services to the City of Sandy Springs Police Department.

Respectfully submitted by the following members of the Evaluation Committee:

Keith Zgonc, Deputy Chief SSPD

Jim Fraker, Captain SSPD

James McNabb, Sergeant SSPD

Jonathan Crowe, IT Director

Jesse Cail, Technology Security Officer